

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8, 13-16, 24, 25, and 30-33 are presently active; Claims 9-12, 17-23, 26-29 were previously canceled without prejudice. Claims 1-8 and 13-16 have been presently amended, and Claims 30-33 have been presently added. No new matter has been added.<sup>1</sup>

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 5, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Dougherty et al (U.S. Pat. No. 5,848,352), hereinafter Dougherty.<sup>2</sup> Claims 2, 6, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dougherty in view of Ziarno (U.S. Pat. Pub. 2001/0001855). Claims 3-4, 7-8, and 15-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dougherty in view of Miller et al (U.S. Pat. Pub. 2001/0051875), hereinafter Miller. Claims 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dougherty in view of Ziarno and further in view of Guheen et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,473,794), hereinafter Guheen.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the courtesy of Examiner Garg to interview this case on July 5, 2006 with Applicants' representative, during which time the issues in the outstanding Office Action were discussed as substantially summarized herebelow.

During the interview, changes to Claim 1 were discussed to clarify that a web page was being transmitted to a user terminal, which differed from that in Dougherty in which a graphical interactive television display was presented to a television viewer. Dougherty discloses that:

---

<sup>1</sup> See specification, pages 73-78 and the figures cited therein for support of the amended and new claims.

<sup>2</sup> The Office Action listed in the body Dougherty et al (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 20020029179) and listed on the attached PTO 892 Dougherty et al (U.S. Pat. No. 5,848,352). U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 20020029179 is not to Dougherty et al. A call to the examiner confirmed the reference as Dougherty et al (U.S. Pat. No. 5,848,352).

Referring now to FIG. 1, a sample **graphical interactive television system** application display is shown. A display screen 110 of a conventional television 112 displays a conventional television show which contains a politician 114 giving a speech. A graphical interactive information system application form 116 having a border 130 is ***displayed by the graphical interactive television system on the screen 110 of the television 112.*** The form 116 may contain text descriptions 126, 128 and pictures or icons 120, 122 corresponding to buttons 118, 124 to allow the user to make a selection by pressing a numeric key using a conventional television remote control device. When the user indicates a selection by pressing a remote control key corresponding to a button 118, 124, a new form may be displayed containing additional information relating to the indicated selection. In one embodiment, one or more selections may cause the graphical interactive television system to send response information to a response collector which may or may not be the information provider. For example, button 118 can allow the user to make a \$25 campaign contribution to the candidate 114. If during the broadcast program a second candidate follows the first candidate 114, an identical form 116 may be displayed related to information or a response collector different from that relating to the first candidate 114. [emphasis added]

Thus, as discussed during the interview, the teachings in Dougherty are directed to a **graphical interactive television system**. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the receiver in such a television system is not configured to receive ***content data for displaying a web page***. Nor would the television system in Dougherty display a user contribution icon including a contribution button configured to be selected to indicate that a contribution is to be given, as presently defined in the independent claims.

Although Examiner Garg seemed in agreement on this point, no agreement was reached pending the examiner's further consideration of this matter.

Hence, for Dougherty's failure to disclose or suggest displaying a web page or displaying a user contribution icon including a contribution button configured to be selected to indicate that a contribution is to be given, independent Claims 1, 5, 13, and 33 (and the claims dependent therefrom) are believed to patentably define over Dougherty.

Further, during the interview, the secondary references of Guheen, Ziarno, and Miller were discussed. Of these references, the Online Donation Management System of Miller was discussed for its teaching of a user contribution to a charitable organization over the Internet.

Following the interview, Applicant reviewed Miller and offers the following comments regarding Miller and the present claims.

Presently, Claim 1 defines a contribution acceptance unit configured to provide an indication of an acceptance of the contribution from a registered user without a subsequent request for information regarding how payment is going to be made. There is no disclosure in Miller of this feature. Rather, in Miller, users are required to enter payment information, as shown in Miller's Figure 8.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the present claims are not anticipated or made obvious in view of Dougherty and Miller, and that the deficiencies in Dougherty and Miller are not overcome by the teachings in Guheen and Ziarno.


Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussions, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/03)  
GJM:RAR:clh

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073  
Ronald A. Rudder, PhD  
Registration No. 45,618